



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/602,525 06/24/2003		Ulrich Bantle	VO-647	1764		
42419	42419 7590 05/24/2005		EXAMINER			
		SEN & ERICKSON	BOSWELL, CHRISTOPHER J			
2800 WES SUITE 36:	+	NS ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
HOFFMA	N ESTAT	ES, IL 60195		3676		
				DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/602,525	BANTLE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Christopher Boswell	3676	

	Examiner	Ait oilit					
	Christopher Boswell	3676					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 May 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP			•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS The proposed amondment/s) filed effer a final rejection.	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ocauso ř				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co 			ecause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	12 501011),	.:				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	•				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7-12 and 14-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-14/19) Paper No(s)							
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	1 Da	niel PS	todola				
		DANIEL P. STODOLA					

DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 11. Does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the argument that the switch of Mochida is not operated by any element of the lock, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As disclosed by Mochida in column 4, lines 7-24, the switch opens or closes with respect to the rotation movement and location of the ignition key with the rotor, and thus the switching element is operated indirectly by the operating part for opening or closing the switching element. For example, the vehicle is not in movement when the ignition key is in the "LOCK" position, resulting in the switch being in the open position; however, when the ignition key is rotated into the "ON" position, the vehicle is capable of movement, and thus the switch closes, thus, the switch is indirectly operated by the operating part, which is actuated by the ignition key.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding the request for an additional telephone interview, the examiner provisionally declines the request, due to the fact the applicant has not stated the purpose of the interview. The applicant is reminded that an Interview Request Summary (PTO-413A) must be submitted with a proposed summary of what the applicant wishes to discuss.

Additionally, it remains unclear as to what the applicant is claiming in claim 1, line 10 with the phrase "one of". The examiner has failed to see how one can select from a single action since the claim language recites that the blocking piece reaches and transitions to the locking position. Furthermore, the applicant's response is not persuasive because it simply restates the claim language without any clarification as to the meaning of the phrase.